

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/619,545	07/16/2003	Lars Olson	1522-1001-1 5943		
	7590 04/16/2007		EXAMINER		
YOUNG & THOMPSON 745 SOUTH 23RD STREET			RAMIREZ, DELIA M		
2ND FLOOR ARLINGTON,	VA 22202		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
ARLINGTON,	VA 22202		1652		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/16/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/619,545	OLSON ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Delia M. Ramirez	1652		

		Alt Ollic				
	Delia M. Ramirez	1652	•			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 16 March 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	ALLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejecti	on.			
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce actión; or (2) as			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compfiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41:37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since			
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.11	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amondment	(DTOL 224)			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		inpliant Amenument	(F10L-324).			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	will not be entered, or b) will will will will will will will	l be entered and an e	explanation of			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>24-28</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good answas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	t before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented. So	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(Is to provide a I).			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu see attached.	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:			
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
-						
•						
·						

Application/Control Number: 10/619,545 Page 2

Art Unit: 1652

ADVISORY ACTION

1. Claims 24-28 are pending.

- 2. The request for entering amendments to the specification and the claims (amendment of claims 24-26, 28 and cancellation of claims 15-23, 29-32), and arguments filed on 3/16/2007 under 37 CFR 1.116 in reply to the Final Action mailed on 11/16/2006 are acknowledged. The proposed amendments to the specification and the claims will be entered. Objections to the specification are hereby withdrawn by virtue of Applicant's amendment. While the claims as amended would be objected to for the reasons set forth below, the amendments to the claims overcome the double patenting objection, 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejections, the 35 USC 101 non-statutory subject matter rejection, the scope of enablement rejection regarding nucleic acids consisting of two or more of SEQ ID NO: 1-7, and the 102/103 art rejections. Thus, the amendments are deemed sufficient to reduce the number of issues for appeal. However, the proposed amendments to the claims fail to overcome the utility rejection for the reasons of record and those set forth below.
- 3. Amended claims 25-26 would be objected to due to the recitation of "nucleic acid according to claim 24, wherein the sequence" as there is no explicit antecedent basis for "the sequence". Amending the claims to recite, for example, "nucleic acid according to claim 24, wherein the nucleic acid consists of SEQ ID NO: X", would obviate the objection.
- 4. Amended claim 28 would be objected due to the recitation of "detecting nucleic acid according to claim 26" for lacking an article next to the term "nucleic acid". It should be amended to recite "detecting the nucleic acid according to claim 26".
- 5. With regard to the utility rejection, Applicant submits that the substantial utility requirement has been met by the teachings of the specification in that Applicant has disclosed the specific disease that can be detected with the claimed nucleic acids. Thus, Applicant believes that a specific and substantial utility has been disclosed. Applicant also submits that the PTO questions the credibility and operability of the

contravenes established scientific principles and beliefs.

claimed invention on the grounds that the utility of the invention has been established with statistical evidence and that a consensus does not exist in the art regarding the role of the ADH7 gene in Parkinson's disease. Applicant reminds the Examiner that Applicant is not required to provide evidence sufficient to establish that an asserted utility is a statistical certainty. Applicant maintains that the Tan, Buervenich and Lucentini references, at best, show lack of consensus in the art regarding the role of ADH7 in Parkinson's disease but do not show that Applicant's asserted utility in Parkinson's disease expressely

Page 3

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive to overcome the rejection. The Examiner acknowledges that Applicant is not required to provide evidence sufficient to establish that an asserted utility is a statistical certainty. However, in the instant case, the Examiner has also provided evidence which completely contradicts Applicant's assertion regarding a link between the disclosed polymorphisms and Parkinson's disease (Tan et al.)

As indicated by the Examiner in the Final action, the Examiner is not contending that Applicant's asserted utility is not specific. Instead, the Examiner has indicated that the asserted utility is not substantial. Therefore, the claimed invention fails to meet the specific and substantial utility prong. With regard to credibility, it is reiterated herein that it is not the Examiner's contention that there is categorically no linkage whatsoever between ADH7 and Parkinson's disease, or that the disclosed polymorphisms are absolutely unrelated to Parkinson's disease. Thus, the Examiner is not deeming Applicant's alleged utility as incredible. Instead, the Examiner has repeatedly indicated that in view of the fact that (1) there is evidence in the art (Tan et al.) that specifically addresses Applicant's study and contradicts Applicant's asserted association between the disclosed polymorphisms and Parkinson's disease, and (2) the alleged association was found by statistical correlation, which is shown by Lucentini as not always sufficient to show an association between a polymorphism and disease, one of skill in the art would have to conduct further research to verify whether the disclosed polymorphisms can be used as

Page 4 Application/Control Number: 10/619,545

Art Unit: 1652

asserted. It is noted that Buervenich et al. discloses the same study that Applicant has disclosed in the specification. The inventorship in the instant application comprises all but one of the authors of the Buervenich et al. reference. Therefore, since Applicant has failed to provide any additional evidence which would lead one of skill in the art to conclude that there is a link between the disclosed polymorphisms and Parkinson's disease, such as how these polymorphisms correlate with the symptoms of the disease, or the biological role of such polymorphism in developing the disease, one cannot reasonably conclude that the asserted utility is substantial or well-established.

For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows: 7.

Claim(s) allowed: NONE

Claim(s) rejected: 24-28

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: NONE

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PMR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Delia M. Ramirez whose telephone number is (571) 272-0938. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Ponnathapura Achutamurthy can be reached on (571) 272-0928. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

> Delia M. Ramirez, Ph.D. **Primary Patent Examiner**

Art Unit 1652

DR

April 12, 2007